

Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone (202) 482-4195 or 482-3814, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On April 12, 1991, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the antidumping duty order on Atlantic salmon from Norway (56 FR 14920). The Department published final results of administrative review of the order on July 14, 1993 (58 FR 37912). The review covered one exporter, Skaarfish A/S, and the period October 3, 1990, through March 31, 1992.

In accordance with § 353.28(c), petitioner and respondent submitted allegations of clerical errors. We were unable to correct these errors and publish amended final results, however, because the petitioner filed a summons with the Court of International Trade (CIT) before we could correct these errors. Subsequently, the CIT granted the Department leave to correct these clerical errors.

##### Scope of the Review

The merchandise covered by this review is fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon. It encompasses the species of Atlantic salmon (*Salmo salar*) marketed as specified herein; the subject merchandise excludes all other species of salmon: Danube salmon; Chinook (also called "king" or "quinnat"); Coho (silver); Sockeye ("redfish" or "blueback"); Humpback (pink); and Chum (dog). Atlantic salmon is whole or nearly whole fish, typically (but not necessarily) marketed gutted, bled, and cleaned, with the head on. The subject merchandise is typically packed in fresh water ice (chilled). Excluded from the subject merchandise are fillets, steaks, and other cuts of Atlantic salmon. Also excluded are frozen, canned, smoked or otherwise processed Atlantic salmon. Fresh and chilled Atlantic salmon is currently provided for under Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) subheading 0302.12.00.02.09. The HTS item number is provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

##### Amendment of Final Results

We have corrected three ministerial errors in Skaarfish's margin calculation for the period October 3, 1990, through March 31, 1992, as follows:

1. Petitioner argues that the Department erred in allocating general depreciation expenses to processing of Atlantic salmon on the basis of square meters. Furthermore, petitioner contends that the remaining amount for

general depreciation which was not allocated to processing of Atlantic salmon was unintentionally not included in the pool of general and administrative expenses.

The Department agrees with the petitioner in part. In its final results of review, the Department allocated depreciation expenses associated with production on the basis of the relative costs incurred for the various production lines. General depreciation was allocated on the basis of square meters. However, the Department erred in not including in the pool of general and administrative expenses those general depreciation expenses not allocated to production. This has been corrected for the amended final results review.

2. Petitioner contends that the Department erred by adding warranty expenses to net U.S. price in its computer program.

The Department agrees that warranty expenses should be subtracted from the net U.S. price, and has corrected its computer program for the amended final results of review.

3. Respondent contends that the Department erred by using a two-digit U.S. dollar/Norwegian kroner exchange rate rather than the six-digit rates used in the preliminary results.

The Department agrees that the six-digit dollar/kroner rate should be used, and has corrected its computer program for the amended final results of review.

##### Final Results of Review

Based on the corrections of the ministerial errors, the Department has amended our final results of review. The following margin exists for the period October 3, 1990, through March 31, 1992.

Skaarfish A/S; 2.15%

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between U.S. price and foreign market value may vary from the percentage stated above. The Department will issue appraisal instructions concerning all respondents directly to the U.S. Customs Service.

This notice serves as a final reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Secretary's presumption that reimbursement of antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This amendment of final results of review and notice are in accordance with section 751(f) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1673(d)) and 19 CFR 353.28(c).

Dated: February 22, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**  
*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-5053 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-M

#### Intent To Revoke Antidumping Duty Orders and Findings and To Terminate Suspended Investigations

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of intent to revoke antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate suspended investigations.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is notifying the public of its intent to revoke the antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations listed below. Domestic interested parties who object to these revocations and terminations must submit their comments in writing no later than the last day of March 1995.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 1, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Michael Panfeld or the analyst listed under Antidumping Proceeding at: Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street & Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone (202) 482-4737.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

The Department may revoke an antidumping duty order or finding or terminate a suspended investigation if the Secretary of Commerce concludes that it is no longer of interest to interested parties. Accordingly, as required by § 353.25(d)(4) of the Department's regulations, we are notifying the public of our intent to revoke the following antidumping duty orders and findings and to terminate the suspended investigations for which the Department has not received a request to conduct an administrative review for the most recent four consecutive annual anniversary months:

##### Antidumping Proceeding

Australia

Canned Bartlett Pears, A-602-039, 38 FR 7566, March 23, 1973, Contact:

Mathew Rosenbaum at (202) 482-4377

#### Chile

Standard Carnations, A-337-602, 52 FR 8939, March 20, 1987, Contact: Joe Fargo at (202) 482-5345

#### France

Brass Sheet & Strip, A-427-602, 52 FR 6995, March 6, 1987, Contact: Chip Hayes at (202) 482-5047

#### Italy

Brass Fire Protection Equipment, A-475-401, 50 FR 8354, March 1, 1985 Contact: Leon McNeill at (202) 482-4236

#### The People's Republic of China

Chloropicrin, A-570-002, 49 FR 10691, March 22, 1984, Contact: Andrea Chu at (202) 482-4733

If no interested party requests an administrative review in accordance with the Department's notice of opportunity to request administrative review, and no domestic interested party objects to the Department's intent to revoke or terminate pursuant to this notice, we shall conclude that the antidumping duty orders, findings, and suspended investigations are no longer of interest to interested parties and shall proceed with the revocation or termination.

#### Opportunity to Object

Domestic interested parties, as defined in § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations, may object to the Department's intent to revoke these antidumping duty orders and findings or to terminate the suspended investigations by the last day of March 1995. Any submission to the Department must contain the name and case number of the proceeding and a statement that explains how the objecting party qualifies as a domestic interested party under § 353.2(k) (3), (4), (5), and (6) of the Department's regulations.

Seven copies of such objections should be submitted to the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Room B-099, U.S. Department of Commerce, Washington, DC 20230. You must also include the pertinent certification(s) in accordance with § 353.31(g) and § 353.31(i) of the Department's regulations. In addition, the Department requests that a copy of the objection be sent to Michael F. Panfeld in Room 4203. This notice is in accordance with 19 CFR 353.25(d)(4)(i).

Dated: February 15, 1995.

**Joseph A. Spetrini,**

*Deputy Assistant Secretary for Compliance.*  
[FR Doc. 95-5054 Filed 2-28-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[C-614-503]

#### Lamb Meat From New Zealand; Preliminary Results of Countervailing Duty Administrative Review and Intent To Revoke the Countervailing Duty Order

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of preliminary results of countervailing duty administrative review and intent to revoke countervailing duty order.

**SUMMARY:** The Department of Commerce (the Department) is conducting an administrative review of the countervailing duty order on lamb meat from New Zealand for the period April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993. We preliminarily determine the total subsidy to be 0.0013 percent *ad valorem* for all firms for the review period. In accordance with 19 CFR 355.7, any rate less than 0.50 percent *ad valorem* is *de minimis*.

In addition, we preliminarily determine that the Government of New Zealand (GONZ) has met the requirements for revocation of the countervailing duty order, including undergoing administrative review for three consecutive years during which the Department has determined that there has been no net subsidy on lamb meat and all subsidies on lamb meat have been abolished. If these preliminary results are sustained in the final results of this review and the Department is satisfied that the GONZ is not likely to reinstate or substitute other subsidy programs on lamb meat, we will revoke the countervailing duty order pursuant to 19 CFR 355.25(a)(1). We invite interested parties to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** March 1, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Gayle Longest or Kelly Parkhill, Office of Countervailing Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-2786.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On September 7, 1993, the Department published a notice of "Opportunity to Request Administrative Review" (58 FR 47116) for the countervailing duty order on lamb meat from New Zealand (50 FR 37708; September 17, 1985). On September 30, 1993, we received a request for review from the New Zealand Meat Producers

Board. The GONZ also requested revocation of the countervailing duty order on lamb meat from New Zealand pursuant to 19 CFR 355.25(b) and certified that all countervailable programs for lamb meat had been eliminated and that it will not reinstate those countervailable programs or substitute other countervailable programs. We initiated the review, covering the period April 1, 1992 through March 31, 1993, on October 18, 1993 (58 FR 53710). The Department is conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Act). The review period is April 1, 1992, through March 31, 1993. The review involves nine companies and five programs.

#### Revocation of the Order

After carefully examining the September 30, 1993, request for revocation of the order, including the certification, the Department determined that certain modifications with respect to the revocation request were necessary. On May 12, 1994, the GONZ resubmitted its certification that met the minimum threshold requirements to be considered for revocation under 19 CFR 355.25(b).

According to 19 CFR 355.25(b), a government meets the minimum threshold requirement for revocation of an order if, in requesting the third consecutive administrative review of the order, the government submits a certification that the government has abolished all subsidy programs for the subject merchandise for a period of three consecutive years, and that the government will not reinstate the abolished programs or substitute other countervailable programs. Under 19 CFR 355.25(a)(1)(i), the Department must have also found that there was no net subsidy for lamb meat in the two consecutive administrative reviews prior to the year in which the government requests revocation, and in the third consecutive administrative review, the Department must also determine that there is no net subsidy. If the foregoing threshold requirements are met, and the Department determines in the review during which revocation has been requested that the GONZ has eliminated all subsidies on lamb meat for the third consecutive year, and is not likely to substitute or replace formerly countervailable programs with new subsidies, then the Department will revoke the order.

With respect to the countervailing duty order on lamb meat, the GONZ met the minimum threshold requirements for consideration of the order for revocation. The Department verified